

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued December 9, 2005, claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0035697 to McCurdy et al. (McCurdy) in view of US Patent Number 6,915,484 to Ayers et al. (Ayers) further in view of Adobe Creative Team, "Adobe Acrobat 4.0 Classroom in a Book, second edition, published on January 4, 2000 (ACT).

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, and new claims 23-30 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to clarify the subject matter that the applicant considers to be the invention.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, and 23-30 is not obvious over McCurdy in view of Ayers and further in view of ACT. McCurdy discloses systems and methods for distributing and viewing electronic documents. In particular, at paragraphs [0014], [0200], and [0203], McCurdy discloses displaying a document in landscape or portrait mode. However, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires electronically laying out during design of a digital magazine a plurality of pages to form the digital magazine, such that each single page fully fits a selected one of either a landscape format display screen, so that each page is displayable in a full-screen manner without borders and with any toolbars of a display program hidden, and wherein the page can be read without zooming, scrolling, or page scrolling. McCurdy does not disclose or suggest laying out pages during design of a digital magazine to meet the requirements of this claim. In particular, McCurdy discloses pages that have not been laid out such that each single page fully fits the display screen and is displayable in a full-screen manner without borders and with any toolbars of a display program hidden and wherein the page can be read without zooming, scrolling, or page scrolling. Rather, McCurdy discloses a two page reading layout of the electronic

magazine or display of a single page with borders, and discloses toolbars displayed to allow zooming, scrolling and page scrolling.

Ayers discloses a method and computer program product for reflowing a PDL page without using the original application used to create the PDL page. Again, Ayers does not disclose or suggest laying out pages during design of a digital magazine to meet the requirements of this claim.

ACT discloses that the opening display of a document may be set to Full Screen mode with toolbars hidden. ACT discloses a full screen mode in which the document is displayed at whatever zoom setting is needed so that the longest dimension of the document exactly fits the corresponding dimension of the display. Further, ACT discloses hiding the toolbars so that the document cannot be zoomed, scrolled, etc. Disclosure of preventing the capability of zooming, scrolling, etc. is not disclosure of designing a document so that it can be read without the need to zoom, scroll, etc. Thus, nothing in ACT discloses or suggests that the document is designed so that each single page fully fits a selected one of either a landscape format or a portrait format display screen (both dimensions exactly fit both dimensions of the display screen) and wherein the page can be read without zooming, scrolling, or page scrolling (text and image sizes and layout are selected during design).

One of skill in the art would not be properly motivated combine the teachings of McCurdy, Ayers, and ACT as suggested by the Examiner. McCurdy discloses several modes in which a document may be displayed. Ayers discloses displaying the document by making actual changes to the document at display time without using the original application used to create the document to make changes to the document file. ACT discloses making changes to the original document file in order to set certain display options. It makes no sense to combine Ayers, which teaches making changes at display time so that changes don't have to be made at design time, with ACT, which teaches setting options at design time.

However, even if McCurdy, Ayers, and ACT are combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result is still not the present invention, as claimed. The combination of McCurdy, Ayers, and ACT still does not disclose or suggest a document that meets all the requirements of the present invention recited, for example, in claim 1. In particular, the combination of McCurdy, Ayers, and ACT does not disclose or suggest laying out during design of a digital magazine pages such that each single page fully fits a display screen, so that each page is displayable in a full-screen manner without borders and wherein the page can be read without zooming, scrolling, or page scrolling.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claim 15, which is similar to claim 1, and according to claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, and 23-30, which depend therefrom, is not unpatentable over McCurdy in view of Ayers, and further in view of ACT.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (25746.0018).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: November 30, 2006

Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
Telephone (202) 424-7500
Facsimile (202) 295-8478